



UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, June 20, 2020

Regular Time 5:30 PM

REMOTE MEETING VIA ZOOM

5:32 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL BY CHAIR: Andy Wiese

AW: Calls the meeting to order and calls the roll.

Roll Call:

Members present:

Andy Wiese (AW), Keith Jenne (KJ), Roger Cavanaugh (RC), Debby Knight (DK), George Lattimer (GL), Katie Rodolico (KR), Joanne Selleck (JS), Anu Delouri (AD), Rebecca Robinson Wood (RRW), Jason Morehead (JM), Kris Kopensky (KK), Aidan Lin (AL), Melanie Cohn (MC), Carol Uribe (CU), Petr Krysl (PK), Laurie Phillips (LP)

Members not present:

Kristin Camper (KC), Dinesh Martien (DiM)

Non-voting Member:

Kristin Camper (KC).

Note: MCAS Miramar representative Kristin Camper does not vote per US Government policy.

City Staff:

Tait Galloway (TG)

Katie Witherspoon (KW) – Sr. Planner, Planning Department

Diego Velasco (DV) – Consultant, Urban Design and Planning

Rick Barrett (RB) – Consultant, M/G

Steven Davidovas (SD) – Consultant

Some members of the public are identified below as:

Barry Bernstein	(BB)
Nancy Groves	(NG)
Diane Ahern	(DA)
Kaitlyn Willoughby	(KWI)
Isabelle Kay	(IK)
Andrew Barton	(AB)
Marcella Escobar Eck	(MEE)
Neil Hyytinen	(NH)
Jeff Dosick	(JD)

Tetsu Kidokuro (TK)
Public member (Public)

5:35 Introduction of New Subcommittee Member

Aidan Lin is the new subcommittee member representing UC San Diego students, succeeding Abbey Reuter.

AL: I am the new subcommittee member representing UCSD students. I am the successor to Abbey Reuter. I have met with Andy Wiese and am looking forward to working with all of you in the group.

5:37 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – April 20, 2021

April 20, 2021, minutes are not available to approve.

Chris Nielsen (CN) to take minutes for this meeting.

5:38 NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

RRW: I would like to bring attention to the trips table in the 1987 Community Plan. I would hope to be able to allow any property owners to use their trips and discourage any unfair discrimination. In some cases, property owners have been fined for attempting to use their properties.

JS: At the tail end of the last UCPG meeting last week ADUs were discussed; I was astonished at what the city allows for. I'm concerned that City ADU regulations allow such large structures. SB10 would be very bad. The group needs to know more about this because it will destroy the nature of the community. The HOA provisions are particularly bad. This is not the way to solve the housing problem.

5:45 Information Item #1: Urban Design Elements #3 – Diego Velasco

Values in [...] denote slide numbers from this meeting's presentation deck.

KW: Went over the upcoming schedule for the plan update.
Reviewed the purpose and function of the OCET (Online Community Engagement Tool).
It does result in measurable outcomes.

An OCET was used for Clairemont in 2019 with an in-person workshop. In 2020, Mira Mesa used a virtual format for their OCET. Staff has been developing a new OCET since the

original vendor does not supply it anymore. Mira Mesa was focused on dwelling units near transit. The new OCET will try to identify where people live.

JM: It will be interesting to see if respondents align with the Community Atlas metrics or views of the subcommittee.

[#12] KW: We will engage the community via multiple channels and try to reflect the community's cross section.

DK: Plan update process so far feels off-kilter. Missing leg is the public facilities financing to pay for all these planned amenities, such as bike infrastructure, parks, and facilities such as Recreation Centers. None are here. What are the DIF fee estimates, when will they be collected? I might feel differently about some scenarios if money were available in, say, 7 years as opposed to 30 years. I request that before the [OCET] survey we have a meeting dedicated to DIF and the schedule for doing these projects. It is critical to have this first. It is hard to navigate without a map.

[#11] AL: I have a question on the demographic slide. Could it be "Check all that apply" rather than "Choose one"?

KW: Yes, we will do this.

MEE: Can we add "property owner" as a category for relationship to community? I agree with DK about infrastructure and choices. Maybe we should divide projects into specific developer projects vs. community wide projects. Bikes would be community wide, not project by project.

PK: UCSD is remote until fall. We must wait until then for the OCET. Material may be distributed via university channels. Next, I agree with ME and DK. It is strange that we talk about density without infrastructure and how to pay for it. Everything needs to go together.

IK: I just sat through three hours at a California Natural Resources and Equity meeting. We need to look at how the green infrastructure would be impacted by density. How much is too much? We need to consider that if we are going to support a 10-minute travel time to green spaces we need to figure this out first. A question for the OCET would be how to get to the spaces (micro-mobility for example).

RC: For many of us long-term residents, we would like to see the projects we've supported for a long time, for example, the south UC library expansion, Marcy Park, and others undertaken. I don't have a sense of priority or understand the funding situation. How would it work? We do need the financial information to think about how the plan would work.

MEE: I agree with many comments, but we can't plan roads and parks without knowing the density, so it's a bit circular.

JD: Debby said it well, but protected bike lanes are the only viable bike solutions that work. I switched to an e-bike as bikes are unsafe in many instances.

NH: I appreciate the comments. It is a circular issue, planning and funding. I have looked at mobility, but we do need to be patient.

DK: We need to know both things. When we had an FBA, there was a pooling of money for projects, so if that is not the way it works, we need to know that now. And we need to know how it will work.

CU: As far as raising money for the bike lanes, in earlier times we had a bicycle license fee to raise money.

AW: DIF is a City Council policy as well.

KW: A City DIF conversation will be held with CN, AW shortly. We are moving forward with mobility. The OCET is not only focused on Land Use Scenarios but is focused on other parts of the Plan. The PMP is going to Council soon, and we cannot move forward on parks until it's approved. Infrastructure plans are moving forward in the background. I'll turn it over to DV.

AW: This discussion was time consuming. But many of us recognize the need to raise this issue publicly.

DV: Planning can be messy.

[#14] April meeting recap, with Focus Area (FA) 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 concepts.

[#16] Land Use summary.

Plazas, Paseos, Promenades, and Podiums. Keys to public spaces.

[#18] Presented feedback from CN's minutes.

[#19] Recognized your comments, and I am processing the notes.

This is our first pass at scenarios. We will go in reverse from FA5 to FA1.

6:30PM FA5.

[#21] Scenario A: Horizontal mixed-use with commercial focus. Commercial will be the primary use. New development in select areas, with 'placemaking' around retail. Primarily surface parking.

[#22] Displayed a development scenario at Governor and Genesee, SE corner. There are important neighborhood services here. Showed a version with the gas station is replaced by an e-charge station.

[#23] Displayed "The Marketplace" at Governor and Regents, NE corner. Housing could be in some parking areas but this would require a parking structure. This strategy requires phasing.

[#24] Scenario B: Vertical mix of uses with integration of housing. Maintain commercial, add more housing, would require structured parking.

[#25] Current conditions.

[#26] University Village at Governor and Genesee, much denser. The corner would be much more significant. Would have an east west paseo connecting the south UC library to the retail. The Marketplace: new buildings over time become even more mixed-use.

[#27] Shows a before and after for a gas station in Golden Hills. The new building wraps around the older service station.

6:40PM Comments?

AB: Supports 'placemaking,' where you separate vehicles and pedestrian use: to the extent it can be encouraged, it takes the concept to the next level.

JS: I'm also thinking about parking. It's a waste of space to have surface parking with Scenario A and B. Land Use Scenarios where the underground parking services retail, movies, and so forth save the above ground for plazas, etc.

MEE: During the Kearny Mesa plan, property owners were surveyed to determine remaining lease terms. Has this been taken into consideration?

MH: This is kind of my neighborhood. I like Scenario B more, and maybe incentives for some structured parking in both locations-are appropriate. From an owner's perspective, incentives are needed.

AL: Andy and I walked through La Jolla Village Square, but the parking areas are horrible, so moving parking would be really good.

TK: Bought our place in 1974, on Mercer Place. Looking at the Marketplace, there is wasted space behind the stores. I have been overseas for a long time, so is there a chance that an east west shuttle connecting this part of UC along Governor?

KR: This is a generic comment, but structured parking is much more expensive than surface. Incentives would probably not be enough. How can the new CPU use incentives effectively?

AW: Good point. What kind of analysis can the city do to encourage this?

DK: I've spent 20 years watching developers, but I don't think they will build underground parking. People won't go underground for grocery shopping.

BB: Thank you Diego for a view of what can be done.

GK: Thinking a lot more about green space. Trees, vegetation, more pleasant environments. Sprouts and Vons are different, more congregate around Sprouts.

AW: Both A and B look good, and I could live with either. I would push to get these designs

out to the committee earlier. Teaching for over 35 years, if the material is not out in advance, you can't expect meaningful discussion. The format minimizes effective input. Connections between these areas and the rest of the community are critical and should be clearly drawn out. Safe 'placemaking' separated from autos makes sense as well as structured parking in select places.

DV: Call it a first pass, and we can combine and block it out more in July.

7:02PM FA4.

FA4 is horizontal Mixed Use with commercial focus.

[#30] Scenario A. Placemaking around a restart of the center, structured parking, stay below 30'. Opportunities for renovation around the edges. We can build public spaces near transit. What would incentivize development there? The east side of I-5, taller is OK, so some redevelopment is possible. The La Jolla Colony commercial center will be later.

[#32] Scenario B. Horizontal and Vertical mixed use with commercial and housing, structured parking, 45' – 60' height (wood construction height). With > 30' height, La Jolla Village Square can be developed with a mix of uses.

[#34] Scenario C. Urban Village, primarily vertical. Significantly integrated housing. Structured parking. 100' height limit. Nobel Drive becomes an area where there is some height as well. There is greater height on La Jolla Village Drive.

La Jolla Colony shopping center: Opportunities to consider how this area integrates with the surrounding area with micro-mobility, buses and so forth. I have only one scenario so far.

Comments?

JS: La Jolla Village Square is appropriate for more housing. The higher you go, the more expensive you get. I don't have a good sense on how high makes it really expensive, so this should inform heights. Whole Foods area has one level of housing currently.

MEE: We represent La Jolla Village Square. The 30' height limit is a big consideration when looking at affordable housing, so other options are being considered. 85' height limit would work. Housing and R&D.

AW: We should all be aware that there is a trade-off between affordable housing and redevelopment. 'Naturally occurring' affordable housing on the site will be displaced. We need to think about incentives to get more affordable housing. This is very important. An overlay is needed. We should plan for small (affordable) retail spaces nearer to UCSD, or student serving businesses will also be displaced. Also note that housing and R&D aren't commercial in the way we use it now. Preserve locally serving retail. 45' – 60' is potentially good for the center, pushed back from the edge. The bird's eye view is easy to visualize, but it is not how people experience places. We need to look at views from the ground level.

AL: The center is used by UCSD students. The commercial areas take on more importance for students. Whole Foods and Ralphs feel disconnected from each other, so a connection would be important. Redevelopment is expensive so affordable housing will be destroyed, but over time the units will come back within the student price range.

NH: Relates FA4 to FA1, connected by UCSD which has no height limit. FA1 and FA4 need a ballot measure vis. Marcella's comment; we can do a 2-level podium with 5 levels of "sticks" [wood construction].

DV: 85' as a "5 over 2".

LP: Lived here for 16 years. I understand the attitudes of the people on the west side of La Jolla Village Square. A high height limit will cast a big shadow on the condos on the west side of Villa La Jolla. Any big increase in density will be impacted by the Theatre District Living and Learning Centre being constructed by UCSD at the intersection of Torrey Pines and North Torrey Pines Roads. I encourage better pedestrian connections between La Jolla Colony and the Nobel transit area (consider a bridge over I-5). The current arrangement for residents of La Jolla Colony is inefficient.

CU: Thinking about the La Jolla Innovation Center [old Rock bottom], the City Council approved this development at 100'.

AW: This is a state of California jurisdiction, so City regulations don't apply.

[#36] GL: Looking at the FA4 arial photo, one concept you've got is the redevelopment of the Marriott on the parcel on the southwest side of I-5 and La Jolla Village Drive. This does not seem to be included. We keep talking about incentives, but the practical way things are done is by offering additional density.

MEE: I did not mean to say there will be no retail at a redeveloped La Jolla Village Square. 85' becomes the sweet spot for us.

MB: Increased verticality makes sense if we can get it on the ballot. The University is developing the LJIC at the Rock Bottom site so we could keep it below 100'.

DK: I don't see any parks in these designs. There is an issue with the whole concept surrounded by major streets and new housing but no new park space. It also has to be considered along with UCSD. Across the country universities push into neighborhoods. The university can do joint ventures, taking a lot of area for student housing or development. There could be unintended consequences.

KJ: I commute through this area very frequently, and it is heavily impacted during commute hours. There is no south I-5 to Nobel off-ramp. Biking is very dangerous. Adding all this density will compound the problem exponentially.

IK: I live off Gilman Dr. If I am coming from campus and want to turn into the La Jolla Village Square / Whole Foods, I ride on sidewalks because it is so dangerous. Bike paths need very careful planning in this area. Many people on the west side of Villa La Jolla live in condos and would be towered over by 100' buildings. Note also helicopters use I-5 as a flight path with an unknown noise impact.

KW: We need transitions in the FAs.

7:35PM FA3.

DV: I am beginning to see how the neighborhood loops might work in FA3.

[#39] Scenario A. Connecting FA4 with FA3 via La Jolla Village Dr. A sort of "Tech Blvd." Can focus high rises along La Jolla Village Dr.

[#40] High visibility for auto traffic.

[#41] Showing a community core-Tech Blvd.

Scenario B. A focus on Executive Dr., Tech promenade, Academia, R&D and core. An innovation corridor. Can see the lack of open spaces and we need to increase. Shows some large superblocks that are not easy to connect.

Scenario C. Urban Village with housing. Focused along transit nodes ("Transit Village").

Prioritize transit areas. We can think about Nobel Dr. as well.

Scenario D. Opportunistic. Not focused on any one particular place. Employment uses are focused and look differently than residential.

Comments?

JS: This comes closest to hitting my concerns here. One thing we should not overlook is non-retail mom and pop commercial that are very important to the community (real estate, legal, etc.). They don't have resources to pay high rents, and don't want to be in a high rise. We need to remember them in the context of an R&D and Life Sciences area.

AW: There is a lot to cover. Building on JS's comment, the mix matters. We have heard about jobs/housing imbalance, which these scenarios would mostly exacerbate. We need to consider the use of the buildings. Do the high buildings fit with our employment uses – is anyone building high rises for bio-tech? 'Tech corridor' is out of step with the current and future uses. Medical offices need to be near the four hospitals. The proposed 'rambla' [Executive Drive] needs housing, not high-tech offices that are deserted at 7PM. Current high rise tenants – finance, legal, etc – not 'tech.' Rethink this concept.

We need to bring in the idea of flexible public benefit planning for this area from the previous conversation [Nico Calavita]. We need to build incentives for what we need from a moderate density base. These all appear to start at max density. We need more parks, affordable housing, multi-modal transportation infrastructure. We need targeted overlays (CPIOZ's).

NH: There are broad range of possibilities. We need to be more flexible. Walking and biking

are critical. As I drive north on Genesee Ave. I see a place for public art at Nobel Dr and Genesee on the Trolley structure. We need to think about connectivity.

IK: "High Visibility for auto traffic" means what?

DV: Would the area be primary seen as an auto thoroughfare or as a location for businesses? Would this make it inviting as a location?

IK: I would not want to live near a trolley. It's too loud. I would put commercial there but would not put any residential there. La Jolla Village Drive turns into Miramar and is really dense with businesses. I agree with NH and others, we need to consider walking and biking.

GL: Scenario D sounds like the antithesis of planning and not something we want. A combo of A and B would make the most sense. I would hate to see Executive or La Jolla Village Drive to be a corridor of 10 story buildings. We need to take advantage of the trolley and the billions it cost.

RRW: It is important to keep the traffic on the major corridors. Scenario A/B makes sense.

DK: This looks like what we have had in the last 15 years, more luxury housing with low transit propensity. We need an answer for this.

AL: I do know a lot of students who reside off campus in this area so we need to make sure they can still live there.

AW: How are these scenarios related to the current plan and CPIOZ? Do they reflect the base zoning or base + new intensity?

KW: All scenarios remove the CPIOZ and have new zoning with increased density across the area. Remove the CPIOZ with no existing zoning retained.

AW: Can you tell us what is the FAR/additional square footage reflected in the drawings? Do you have a scenario reflecting current base zoning for us to examine?

KW: Not in this area. The likelihood of development with the current CPIOZ and base zoning was very small.

8:10PM FA1 and FA2 together.

DV: Scenario A: Existing pattern with some housing in FA2. For FA1, focus on campus, placemaking, a bit more insular design.

[#54] FA2 Placemaking, as long as we do mobility correctly along Eastgate.

DK: How?

DV: Campus Point Drive and Eastgate need better pedestrian and bike mobility.

[#52] Scenario B: Focus growth along North Torrey Pines, Genesee, and Eastgate and the south edge of FA2 as it touches Eastgate as potential for connections the Executive Drive station.

Scenario C: Add housing at the extreme south edge of FA1.

NH: I'll reiterate my FA4 comments. Modify the coastal height limit, maybe in FA1 as well. We need to consider this more carefully. Outside FA2 in the Transition Zone, some mixed uses should be considered with greater flexibility. Shuttles and micro-mobility can be tied to new transit.

[#59] DK: Lots of very important habitats, MSCP, birds, and so forth. I walked the Towne Centre View development yesterday; the developer wants to shut out residents. This is the opposite of visionary. This is a big issue as employment in biotech increased. I'm not sure that residents would be welcome. Habitat would be heavily impacted, and this should be considered.

IK: Requires a different approach. With habitat maybe consider it first rather than last. North Torrey Pines could be activated better. I ride there on weekends and there is nobody.

AW: I want to reinforce NH's comment on mixed use. FA1 and FA2 should be jobs focused as the highest and best use. There are few places appropriate for housing. Housing should go into FA3. The 'tech corridor' idea belongs here. I disagree about the FA1 height limit; unlike FA4, it is in the coastal zone, visible from the coast to Mt. San Jacinto at times. DK and IK put green infrastructure at the top of the list. We should have a land use scenario that gives us what we value with housing, jobs, greenspace all being reflected.

GL: We need to keep in mind that UC is blessed with open space not available in the rest of the city. I'm not suggesting this be diminished, but the City Council will want to know how it relates to the rest of the city.

We should talk about the probable scenario for each area. How would the land use balance work? This is what we added to the scenarios with residential vs. non-residential, at least giving a preliminary idea of where we're heading.

KW: Understood, and we need to see what level of analysis can be done short term. After the OCET we can do this type of analysis. Mobility and Traffic would have a preferred scenario and one or two alternatives. We can look into the residential / commercial mix, but I'm not sure it could be ready next month.

NH: On the FA1 height, I understand this. Could be handled case by case, rather than one size fits all. Life Science development has difficulties at 30'.

MEE: Canyons: some are private, with some areas not accessible to the public that could be opened up.

DK: I agree with AW about the height limit in FA1. Also, there is a big problem with the MHPA lands with mountain bikes, with the city and county not meeting their obligations to protect the land at present. Fixing this in the new plan is a big objective.

AW: Thanks everyone for a good discussion, and to DV and KW in particular.

8:39PM Adjourned.